

Overview of Evaluation Factors and Selection Criteria for CWA Section 319 Competitive Grants

by
Mitra N. Jha



Clean Water Act (CWA) Funding

- CWA Section 319(h) Program – Provides grant funds for implementation of management measures that will reduce NPS pollution; recipients must meet program eligibility requirements
- CWA Section 518(f) - Authorizes Tribes to be treated in the same manner as states and receive grants under Section 319

Section 319(h) Allocation

- Eligible activities include NPS program costs, project implementation, staff education, development and/or implementation of a watershed-based plan, and building institutional capacity
- Competitive Funds
 - Up to \$150,000
 - Eligible activities are limited to on-the-ground restoration project related expenses and development and/or implementation of a watershed-based plan

3

Nonfederal Match Requirements

- CWA Section 319 grant requires a 40% nonfederal match of the total project cost
- If a Tribe demonstrates that the 40% match imposes undue financial hardship, EPA may approve a 10% nonfederal match
 - A Tribe describes their particular need in a letter to the Regional Administrator
- PPG: If the funds will go into a PPG, the match can be reduced to 5%

4

FY2008-09 – CWA Section 319 Grant Schedule

- Eligibility Determination Date – October 10, 2008
- Competitive grant proposal work plan due to EPA Regional office – December 1, 2008 (Anticipated)
- EPA Headquarters notifies Regions and Tribes of project selections – March 5, 2009 (Anticipated)
- Final grant application due to EPA Regional office – April 1, 2009 (Anticipated)

5

Preparation of Competitive Grant Proposals

- Key concepts in Tribal NPS Planning Handbook
 - Identify the water quality problem(s) to address
 - Select recommended BMP/Management Measure(s) from the NPS Management Plan
- Guidelines on Awarding CWA Section 319 Grants to Indian Tribes
 - Regional Threshold Evaluation Criteria
 - Proposal Evaluation Review Sheet

6

Competitive Funding Process

Tribes submit competitive grant proposals to Regional Office by December 1, 2008 (Anticipated)



7

Regional Review Process

- Regions evaluate final proposals to determine whether they meet the threshold evaluation criteria in order to be forwarded on to national competition:
 - (1) TAS/FAE Determination
 - (2) Approved NPS Assessment Report and Management Program Plan
 - (3) Provides match
 - (4) Maximum budget is \$150,000 of federal funds (plus the required match)
 - (5) All proposed activities are related to the waters on the Reservation
 - (6) All proposed activities are consistent with the Tribe's approved NPS Management Plan
 - (7) Workplan includes the six required elements (same as base workplans)

8

Project Eligibility

- Watershed projects
 - On-the-ground water quality improvement projects
 - Beneficial to waters impaired by NPS pollution
 - Expected to achieve actual water quality benefits
- Development of watershed based plans

9

Proposals must include detailed information which fully address the 2-Step Review Process:

- (1) The proposals must comply with the Regional Threshold Evaluation Criteria before being forwarded on to national competition.
- (2) The proposals are evaluated by the EPA Watershed Project Review Committee using nine evaluation factors.

10

Regional Threshold Evaluation Criteria Part I

Essential Workplan Elements

- Applying for one competitive grant
- Applying up to a maximum budget of \$150,000 of Federal funds
- Provides the required match of the total project cost
- Propose to fund activities related to waters within the reservation

11

Regional Threshold Evaluation Criteria Part II

Description of each significant category of NPS activity to be addressed;

- Work plan components;
- Work plan commitments for each work plan components (anticipated environmental outcomes and outputs);

12

Regional Threshold Evaluation Criteria Part II Continue...

- Estimated funding amounts for each work plan component;
- Roles and responsibilities of recipient and EPA in carrying out the work plan commitments
- Reporting schedule and a description of the performance evaluation process

13

EPA HQ Review Process

- Once the Region determines Tribe's grant proposal passes the threshold evaluation criteria review, the proposal is forwarded to EPA HQ for the national competition
- National review committee reviews the proposals and evaluates them based on the evaluation factors and forwards ranking scores to EPA HQ
 - Evaluation factors based on Guideline's selection criteria

14

Ranking Committee Evaluation Review Sheet

Evaluation Factors	Weight	Score
<i>Rank with score of 0 to 5. (Weight x Value = Score) Maximum score 900.</i>		
a. The extent, and quality, to which the subcategories of NPS pollution are identified and described.	15	
The extent, and quality, to which the water quality problems or threats to be addressed are identified and described.	15	
The extent, and quality, to which the goals and objectives of the project specifically identify the project location and activities to be implemented.	20	
The extent to which significant water quality benefits will be achieved as a result of the project.	20	
The specificity of the budget in relation to each work plan component.	15	
The level of detail in relation to the schedule for achieving the activities in the work plan.	15	
The extent to which the roles and responsibilities of the recipient and project partners in carrying out the work plan activities are specifically identified.	15	
The extent to which the performance evaluation process include specific, measurable, and objective factors that are clearly linked to specific work plan activities throughout the project period and the anticipated environmental outcomes and outputs.	15	
The extent, and quality, to which the proposal addresses one of the four factors regarding the watershed-based plan and watershed project implementation.	40	
		15

Evaluation Factor #1

- The extent, and quality, to which the subcategories of NPS pollution are identified and described.
 - Identifies sources at the subcategory level with estimates of the extent to which these subcategories are present in the watershed.
 - Example: X number of dairy cattle feedlots needing upgrading; Y rows of crops needing sediment control; or Z linear miles of eroded streambank needing remediation.

Evaluation Factor #2

- The extent, and quality, to which the water quality problems or threats to be addressed are identified and described.
 - Example: Specifically describes the water quality problems or threats in relation to impairments to water quality standards or other parameters that indicate stream health (decreases in fish or macroinvertebrate counts).

17

Evaluation Factor #3

- The extent, and quality, to which the goals and objectives of the project specifically identify the project location and activities to be implemented.
 - Specifically identifies where the NPS project will take place and the waterbody affected by the NPS pollutants (provides map).
 - Provides details on the specific activities that will be implemented (identifies specific BMPs/Management measures to be implemented).

18

Evaluation Factor #4

- The extent to which significant water quality benefits will be achieved as a result of the project.
 - Incorporate specific water quality-based goals that are linked to: water quality standards for one or more pollutants/uses; measurable, in-stream reductions in a pollutant; or improvements in a parameter that indicates stream health (e.g., increases in fish or macroinvertebrate counts).
 - If information is not available to make specific estimates, water quality-based goals may include narrative descriptions and best professional judgment based on existing information.

19

Evaluation Factor #5

- The specificity of the budget in relation to each work plan component.
 - Outlines total operational and construction costs of the project (including match).
 - Provides specifics of the budget in relation to each work plan component.
 - Budget categories may include, but not limited to: personnel; travel; equipment; supplies; contractual; and construction costs.

20

Evaluation Factor #6

- The level of detail in relation to the schedule for achieving the activities identified in the work plan.
 - Provides schedule of activities for each work plan component.
 - Identifies a specific “start” and “end” date for each work plan component.
 - Identifies an estimate of the specific work years for each work plan component.
 - Identifies the interim milestone dates for achieving each work plan component.
 - Indicates “readiness to proceed.”

21

Evaluation Factor #7

- The extent to which the roles and responsibilities of the recipient and project partners in carrying out the work plan activities are specifically identified.
 - Clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of each responsible party for each work plan component.
 - Defines specific level of effort for responsible parties for each work plan component.
 - Identifies parties who will take the lead in carrying out the work plan commitments.
 - Identifies other programs, parties, and agencies that will provide additional technical and/or financial assistance.

22

Evaluation Factor #8

- *The extent to which the performance evaluation process meets each of the following sub-criteria:*
 - (i) Extent and quality to which the proposal demonstrates potential environmental results (i.e., whether the project will result in the protection of water resources), anticipated outputs and outcomes, and how the outcomes are linked to EPA's Strategic Plan. (Value = 2 points maximum.)
 - (ii) Extent and quality to which the proposal demonstrates a sound plan for measuring progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes (examples of outputs and outcomes can be found in section B.I of this announcement). (Value = 1 point maximum.)
 - (iii) Extent and quality to which the applicant adequately documented and/or reported on progress towards achieving the expected results (e.g., outputs and outcomes) under Federal agency assistance agreements performed within the last 3 years, and if such progress was not being made, whether the applicant adequately documented and/or reported why not. (Value = 2 points maximum.)

23

Evaluation Factor #8

- The extent to which the performance evaluation process includes specific, measurable, and objective factors that are clearly linked to specific work plan activities throughout the project period and anticipated environmental outcomes and outputs.
 - Quarterly Reporting
 - Before and After photos
 - Water Quality data

24

Evaluation Factor #8 Examples

- NRCS and Environmental Trust will monitor riparian recovery with photo monitoring points. We already have a GPS integrated digital camera that we use for this.
- Environmental Trust will continue to monitor Joe Moses Creek, Buffalo Creek, Rebecca Creek, Owhi Creek, Little Nespelem River, and Peter Dan Creek for turbidity, pH, dissolved oxygen, flow, temperature, coliform bacteria, and conductivity. We will have “before and after” data.

25

Evaluation Factor #9

- The extent, and quality, to which the proposal addresses one of the following four factors:
 - (1) The proposed work plan develops a watershed-based plan and implements a watershed-based plan.
 - (2) The proposed work plan develops a watershed-based plan and implements a watershed project (that does not implement a watershed-based plan).
 - (3) The proposed work plan implements a watershed-based plan.
 - (4) The proposed work plan implements a watershed project that is a significant step towards solving NPS impairments or threats on a watershed-wide basis.

26

Proposal Submission

- All proposals received by EPA or submitted electronically through Grants.gov or hard copy to Region by the submission deadline will first be screened by the EPA Regional Office contact against the threshold criteria in Section III of the announcement.
- Proposals that do not pass the threshold review will not be evaluated further or considered for funding. Proposals that meet the threshold evaluation criteria will be forwarded to EPA Headquarters NPS Control Branch.

27

Watershed Project Review Committee

- EPA will establish a Watershed Project Review Committee to review eligible proposals that is comprised of 7 EPA staff, which includes 2 EPA Regional State NPS Coordinators, 3 EPA Regional Tribal NPS Coordinators, 1 staff member of the EPA Headquarters NPS Control Branch, and 1 staff member of the EPA's American Indian Environmental Office.

28

scoring the Proposals

- Scores for each proposal will be developed by each Committee member based on evaluating the proposal against the factors and weighting system described above in section V.A. Based on these scores, EPA will calculate the average score for each proposal and then rank the proposals based on the resulting average scores.
- The ranking list will be provided to the Selection Official who makes final funding decisions. In making final funding decisions, the Selection Official will consider the average proposal scores and may also take into account if the proposal plans to develop or implement a watershed-based plan (as described in Attachment A).

29

Award Administration Information

- **Award Notices**
- **Administrative and National Policy Requirements**
 1. *Grant Requirements*
 2. *Administrative Costs*
 3. *Satisfactory Progress*
 4. *Operation and Maintenance*
- **Reporting**
- **Dun and Bradstreet Number**
- **Dispute Resolution**

30

Notice to Regions/Tribes

- EPA Headquarters notifies Regions/Tribes of proposals selected for grant
- Tribes submit final grant applications to Region Cover letter
 - Application for Federal Assistance (Standard Form 424)
 - Full work plan and budget

31

Award Process

- Base funds and competitive funds can be kept separately as two grants or combined together into one grant
- Region reviews final grant application for
 - Content
 - Completeness
 - Compliance with applicable guidelines and regulations
- Grant awarded

32



Questions?

33